A U M

The sages are born for the good of the world. They bear physical pains for its benefit. —TUKARAM, the Maratha sage

THEOSOPHY

Vol. XXXV May, 1947 No. 7

H. P. BLAVATSKY—WHERE, WHO, WHAT?

H P. BLAVATSKY—where, who, what? Who can trace the pattern of a life whose journeyings circled the globe again and again, on missions of mysterious origin and concealed destination—a life, moreover, whose inner path was still more thoroughly obscured, more effectively guarded? *Where* is H.P.B.? Who seeks her in vain, except one who seeks in places, times, events, circumstances? *Who* was she, what is she now? Need any ask, save him who does not care to learn her *presence?* The real H.P.B. was seen by some and known to others, but those who knew her best seem never to have attempted a full explanation of that Being.

In philosophy, riddles and paradoxes are not for glib answers, but for the extension of the mind. We need to be led into, not *past,* the mysteries that give meaning to life. The foolish think to absorb truth; the wise seek to be absorbed in it. One reaches for "solutions"; the other reaches through them, into further depths of the unknown. To know answers is something, perhaps, but to know ever-opening questions is infinitely more—is, in fact, the process of spiritual growth.

There were several H.P.B.'s. There was the "accredited representative of the Masters of Wisdom," who recorded a body of knowledge remarkable for its depth, range, reasonableness and universality. There was the teacher of an ethical system correlatively scientific and transcendental. There was the friend and companion of devoted theosophists, of extreme agnostics and gentle pietists alike. Regardless of past mistakes, present betrayal or possible future treachery, H.P.B. was the friend to the nobility of each soul, companion in their highest aspirations. There was, again, the brilliant discourser who confounded, in person, various "authorities" of her century. There was the H.P.B. her daily associates knew, a warm, beloved personality who rendered life

as exciting, as vivid, as an electric storm—and quite as startling, upon occasion. Her directness and uncompromising honesty were not easy to assimilate, although those who succeeded in partially releasing themselves from the liens of human nature savored for a time—with the living example before them—the possibilities of a higher life. The Russian story writer and chronicler of "Indian Days" must also be counted; her sparkling imagination was a byword in her family from her childhood on, as were her rebellious independence and heretical ideas.

But who is the H.P.B. we seek to *know?* There have been many guesses, from lookers-on; but was "Isis" ever unveiled, except in the heart and soul of the selfless aspirant? The poor in heart may deny a mystery, but they can not deny it to others. Mr. Judge offered a significant suggestion, as early as 1888: "It must not be forgotten that the part played by H.P.Blavatsky can never be rightly given to the world, because it would not be understood. Her service and efforts can never be estimated, but they may be glimpsed by intuitional natures."

Other evidence that Madame Blavatsky is not to be held accountable to the "tribunal of Public opinion—that most flippantly cruel, prejudiced and unjust of all tribunals," as a Mahatma wrote—may be gleaned from H.P.B.'s letter, "Why I Do Not Return to India," now reprinted for the first time in this magazine. Here, in the plainest language possible, is the key to the betrayal of H.P.B. in India, in 1884, and therefore the key to all later betrayals of herself, and of William Q. Judge after her. That the betrayal of 1884 was in some measure, or rather, for some T.S. members, neither conceived nor realized *as a betrayal,* is an important psychological clue. From the vantage-point of sixty years of subsequent theosophical history, it is possible to identify the whole circumstance as another bitter illustration of the great wrongs that may be committed when "good reasons" are not also right motives.

There is only one rock on which workers for the Theosophical Movement can founder, and that is—*personalities.* As to the ideas of Theosophy, attack and defense are alike impossible: they may be promulgated, rejected or ignored, but personal prestige and authority are beside the point. H.P.B. writes, "A conviction that wanes when any particular personality is absent is no conviction at all"; likewise, a "truth" which is compelling only so long as a certain leader is present, may have compelled

belief, opinion or agreement, but never understanding nor first-hand knowledge.

It is the privilege and the responsibility of each one to conceive as he will the personality of H.P.Blavatsky and the Being called "H.P.B." The greater the being, the larger and clearer the mirror he becomes for other men to see their reflections in. Nothing so logically explains the widely divergent views of "eye-witnesses" in the case of H.P.B. as their own widely divergent natures. Not until philosophical perspective is substituted for personal opinions will the valid inspiration of her life become accessible.

Each student of Theosophy establishes H.P.B.'s "biography" for himself. If he remains a student, conscientiously extending his studies, honestly facing *his own nature* in their light—he finds himself constantly refining his discrimination and, consequently, his understanding of the Teacher. Following this course, he is not apt to pose as an "authority" on H.P.B., nor is he likely to need one.

"The Root of Consciousness"

The world in which blossom the transitory and evanescent flowers of personal lives is not the real permanent world; but that one in which we find the root of consciousness, that root which is beyond illusion and dwells in the eternity. I mean by this root the thinking entity, the Ego which incarnates, whether we regard it as an "angel," "Spirit," or a Force. Of that which falls under our sensuous perceptions only what grows directly from, or is attached to this invisible root above, can partake of its immortal life. Hence every noble thought, idea and aspiration of the personality it informs, proceeding from and fed by this root, must become permanent.

Unless a God descends as an *Avatar,* no divine principle can be otherwise than cramped and paralysed by turbulent, animal matter. Heterogeneity will always have the upper hand over homogeneity, on this plane of illusions, and the nearer an essence is to its root-principle, Primordial Homogeneity, the more difficult it is for the latter to assert itself on earth. Spiritual and divine powers lie dormant in every human Being; and the wider the sweep of his spiritual vision the mightier will be the God within him. But as few men can feel that God, and since, as an average rule, deity is always bound and limited in our thought, therefore it is difficult to understand our philosophy. —H.P.B.

WHY I DO NOT RETURN TO INDIA

[This letter, one of the most extraordinary documents ever penned by H.P.B., will be somewhat perplexing to the casual reader. Written to the Indian members of the T.S., in the last year of Madame Blavatsky's life, it is a karmic vision that both interprets the past and prophesies the future—and will yield a message for all Theosophists, wherever and however situated. Since it is addressed to individuals, and was not written as a tract on Theosophy, this letter contains declarations very rarely made by H.P.B.—statements which can be made only to those who are so firmly grounded in the philosophy that they will not mistake them for "claims," "dogmas" or delusions of grandeur. "Why I Do Not Return to India" (*part* of which was printed in *The Theosophist,* July, 1929) affords the background of meaning against which may be measured various crises of the present Theosophical Movement, and also the several articles by Judge and Olcott printed by this Magazine in recent issues.—Eds. THEOSOPHY.]

TO MY BROTHERS OF ARYAVARTA,

In April, 1890, five years elapsed since I left India. Great kindness has been shown to me by many of my Hindu brethren at various times since I left; especially this year (1890), when, ill almost to death, I have received from several Indian Branches letters of sympathy, and assurances that they have not forgotten her to whom India and the Hindus have been most of her life far dearer than her own Country.

It is, therefore, my duty to explain why I do not return to India and my attitude with regard to the new leaf turned in the history of the T.S. by my being formally placed at the head of the Theosophical Movement in Europe. For it is not solely on account of bad health that I do not return to India. Those who have saved me from death at Adyar, and twice since then, could easily keep me alive there as They do me here. There is a far more serious reason. A line of conduct has been traced for me here, and I have found among the English and Americans what I have so far vainly sought for in India.

In Europe and America, during the last three years, I have met with hundreds of men and women who have the courage to avow their conviction of the real existence of the Masters, and who are working for Theosophy on *Their* lines and under *Their* guidance, given through my humble self.

In India, on the other hand, ever since my departure, the true spirit of devotion to the Masters and the courage to avow it

has steadily dwindled away. At Adyar itself, increasing strife and conflict has raged between personalities; uncalled for and utterly undeserved animosity—almost hatred—has been shown towards me by several members of the staff. There seems to have been something strange and uncanny going on at Adyar, during these last years. No sooner does a European, most Theosophically inclined, most devoted to the Cause, and the personal friend of myself or the President, set his foot in Headquarters, than he becomes forthwith a personal enemy to one or other of us, and what is worse, ends by injuring and deserting the Cause.

Let it be understood at once that I accuse no one. Knowing what I do of the activity of the forces of Kali Yuga, at work to impede and ruin the Theosophical Movement, I do not regard those who have become, one after the other, my enemies—and that without any fault of my own—as I might regard them, were it otherwise.

One of the chief factors in the reawakening of Aryavarta which has been part of the work of the Theosophical Society, was the ideal of Masters. But owing to want of judgment, discretion, and discrimination, and the liberties taken with Their names and *Personalities,* great misconceptions arose concerning Them. I was under the most solemn oath and pledge never to reveal the whole truth to anyone, excepting to those who, like Damodar, had been finally selected and called by Them. All that I was then permitted to reveal was, that there existed somewhere such great men; that some of Them were Hindus; that They were learned as none others in all the ancient wisdom of Gupta Vidya, and had acquired all the Siddhis—not as these are represented in tradition and the "blinds" of ancient writings, but as they are in fact and nature—and also that I was a Chela of one of Them. However, in the imagination of some Hindus, the most wild and ridiculous fancies soon grew up concerning Them. They were referred to as "Mahatmas" and still some too-enthusiastic friends belittled Them with their strange fancy-pictures; our opponents, describing a Mahatma as a full Jivanmukta, urged that, as such, He was debarred from holding any communication whatsoever with persons living in the world. They also maintained that as this is the Kali Yuga, it was impossible that there could be any Mahatmas at all in our age.

These early misconceptions notwithstanding, the idea of the Masters, and belief in Them, has already brought its good fruit in India. Their chief desire was to preserve the true religious and

philosophical spirit of ancient India; to defend the Ancient Wisdom contained in its Darshanas and Upanishads against the systematic assaults of the missionaries; and finally to reawaken the dormant ethical and patriotic spirit in those youths in whom it had almost disappeared owing to college education. Much of this has been achieved by and through the Theosophical Society, in spite of all its mistakes and imperfections.

Had it not been for Theosophy, would India have had her Tukaram Tatya doing now the priceless work he does, and which no one in India ever thought of doing before him? Without the Theosophical Society, would India have ever thought of wrenching from the hands of the learned but unspiritual Orientalists the duty of reviving, translating and editing the Sacred Books of the East, of popularizing and selling them at a far cheaper rate, and at the same time in a far more correct form than had ever been done at Oxford? Would our respected and devoted brother Tukaram Tatya himself have ever thought of doing so, had he not joined the Theosophical Society? Would your political Congress itself have ever been a possibility, without the Theosophical Society? Most important of all, one at least among you has fully benefited by it; and if the Society had never given to India but that one future Adept (Damodar) who has now the prospect of becoming one day a Mahatma, Kali Yuga notwithstanding, that alone would be proof that it was not founded at New York and transplanted to India in vain. Finally, if any one among the three hundred millions of India can demonstrate, proof in hand, that Theosophy, the T.S. or even my humble self, have been the means of doing the slightest harm, either to the country or any Hindu, that the Founders have been guilty of teaching pernicious doctrines, or offering bad advice—then and then only, can it be imputed to me as a crime that I have brought forward the ideal of the Masters and founded the Theosophical Society.

Aye, my good and never-to-be-forgotten Hindu Brothers, the name alone of the holy Masters, which was at one time invoked with prayers for Their blessings, from one end of India to the other—Their name alone has wrought a mighty change for the better in your land. It is not to Colonel Olcott or to myself that you owe anything, but verily to these names, which, but a few years ago, had become a household word in your mouths.

Thus it was that, so long as I remained at Adyar, things went on smoothly enough, because one or other of the Masters was almost constantly present among us, and their spirit ever protected

the Theosophical Society from real harm. But in 1884, Colonel Olcott and myself left for a visit to Europe, and while we were away the Padri-Coulomb "thunderbolt" descended. I returned in November, and was taken most dangerously ill. It was during that time and Colonel Olcott's absence in Burma, that the seeds of all future strifes, and—let me say at once—disintegration of the Theosophical Society, were planted by our enemies. What with the Patterson-Coulomb-Hodgson conspiracy, and the faint-heartedness of the chief Theosophists, that the Society did not then and there collapse should be sufficient proof of how it was protected. Shaken in their belief, the faint-hearted began to ask: "Why, if the Masters are genuine Mahatmas, have They allowed such things to take place, or why have They not used Their powers to destroy this plot or that conspiracy, or even this or that man and woman?" Yet it had been explained numberless times that no Adept of the Right Path will interfere with the just workings of Karma. Not even the greatest of Yogis can divert the progress of Karma, or arrest the natural results of actions for more than a short period, and even in that case, these results will only reassert themselves later with even tenfold force, for such is the occult law of Karma and the Nidanas.

Nor again will even the greatest of phenomena aid real spiritual progress. We have each of us to win our Moksha or Nirvana by our own merit, not because a Guru or Deva will help to conceal our shortcomings. There is no merit in having been created an immaculate Deva or in being a God; but there is the eternal bliss of Moksha looming forth for the man who becomes *as a God* and Deity Itself by his own personal exertions. It is the mission of Karma to punish the guilty, and not the duty of any Master. But those who act up to Their teachings and live the life of which They are the best exemplars, will never be abandoned by *Them,* and will always find Their beneficent help whenever needed—whether obviously or invisibly. This is of course addressed to those who have not yet quite lost their faith in Masters; those who have never believed, or have ceased to believe in Them, are welcome to their own opinions. No one, except themselves perhaps some day, will be the losers thereby.

As for myself, who can charge me with having acted like an imposter? with having, for instance, taken one single pie* from any living soul? with having ever asked for money, or with having accepted it, notwithstanding that I was repeatedly offered

* *Pie, i.e.,* "penny." A *pie* is the smallest Anglo-Indian coin.—Eds.

large sums? Those who, in spite of this, have chosen to think otherwise, will have to explain what even my traducers of the Padri class and Psychical Research Society have been unable to explain to this day, *viz.*, the motive for such fraud. They will have to explain why, instead of taking and making money, I gave away to the Society every penny I earned by writing for the papers; why at the same time I nearly killed myself with overwork and incessant labour year after year, until my health gave way, so that but for my Master's repeated help, I should have died long ago from the effects of such voluntary hard labour. For the absurd Russian spy theory, if it still finds credit in some idiotic heads, has long ago disappeared, at any rate from the official brains of the Anglo-Indians.

If, I say, at that critical moment, the members of the Society, and especially its leaders at Adyar, Hindu and European, had stood together as one man, firm in their conviction of the reality and power of the Masters, Theosophy would have come out more triumphantly than ever, and none of their fears would have ever been realized, however cunning the legal traps set for me, and whatever mistakes and errors of judgment I, their humble representative, might have made in the executive conduct of the matter.

But the loyalty and courage of the Adyar Authorities, and of the few Europeans who had trusted in the Masters, were not equal to the trial when it came. In spite of my protests, I was hurried away from Headquarters. Ill as I was, almost dying in truth, as the physicians said, yet I protested, and would have battled for Theosophy in India to my last breath, had I found loyal support. But some feared legal entanglements, some the Government, while my best friends believed in the doctors' threats that I must die if I remained in India. So I was sent to Europe to regain my strength, with a promise of speedy return to my beloved Aryavarta.

Well, I left, and immediately intrigues and rumours began. Even at Naples, I already learnt that I was reported to be meditating to start in Europe "a rival Society" and bust up Adyar" (!!). At this I laughed. Then it was rumoured that I had been *abandoned* by the Masters, been disloyal to Them, done this or the other. None of it had the slightest truth or foundation in fact. Then I was accused of being, at best, a hallucinated *medium,* who had mistaken "spooks" for living Masters; while others declared that the real H. P. Blavatsky was dead—had

died through the injudicious use of *Kundalini*—and that the form had been forthwith seized upon by a Dugpa Chela, who was the present H.P.B. Some again held me to be a witch, a sorceress, who for purposes of her own played the part of a philanthropist and lover of India, while in reality bent upon the destruction of all those who had the misfortune to be *psychologised* by me. In fact, the powers of psychology attributed to me by my enemies, whenever a fact or a "phenomenon" could not be explained away, are so great that they alone would have made of me a most remarkable Adept—independently of any Masters or Mahatmas. In short, up to 1886, when the S.P.R. Report was published and this soap-bubble burst over our heads, it was one long series of false charges, every mail bringing something new. I will name no one; nor does it matter who said a thing and who repeated it. One thing is certain: with the exception of Colonel Olcott, everyone seemed to banish the Masters from their thoughts and Their spirit from Adyar. Every imaginable incongruity was connected with these holy names, and I alone was held responsible for every disagreeable event that took place, every mistake made. In a letter received from Damodar in 1886, he notified me that the Masters' influence was becoming with every day weaker at Adyar; that They were daily represented as less than "second-rate Yogis," totally denied by some, while even those who believed in, and had remained loyal to Them, feared even to pronounce Their names. Finally, he urged me very strongly to return, saying that of course the Masters would see that my health should not suffer from it. I wrote to that effect to Colonel Olcott, imploring him to let me return, and promising that I would live at Pondicherry, if needed, should my presence not be desirable at Adyar. To this I received the ridiculous answer that no sooner should I return, than I should be sent to the Andaman Islands as a Russian spy, which of course Colonel Olcott subsequently found out to be absolutely untrue. The readiness with which such a futile pretext for keeping me from Adyar was seized upon, shows in clear colours the ingratitude of those to whom I had given my life and health. Nay more, urged on, as I understood, by the Executive Council, under the entirely absurd pretext that, in case of my death, my heirs might claim a share in the Adyar property, the President sent me a legal paper to sign, by which I formally renounced any right to the Headquarters or even to live there without the Council's permission. This, although I had spent several thousand rupees of my own private money, and had

devoted my share of the profits of *The Theosophist* to the purchase of the house and its furniture. Nevertheless I signed the renunciation without one word of protest. I saw I was not wanted, and remained in Europe in spite of my ardent desire to return to India. How could I do otherwise than feel that all my labours had been rewarded with ingratitude, when my most urgent wishes to return were met with flimsy excuses and answers inspired by those who were hostile to me?

The result of this is too apparent. You know too well the state of affairs in India for me to dwell longer upon details. In a word, since my departure, not only has the activity of the movement there gradually slackened, but those for whom I had the deepest affections, regarding them as a mother would her own sons, have turned against me. While in the West, no sooner had I accepted the invitation to come to London, than I found people —the S.P.R. Report and wild suspicion and hypotheses rampant in every direction notwithstanding—to believe in the truth of the great Cause I have struggled for, and in my own *bona fides*.

Acting under the Master's orders I began a new movement in the West on the original lines; I founded *Lucifer,* and the Lodge which bears my name. Recognizing the splendid work done at Adyar by Colonel Olcott and others to carry out the second of the three objects of the T.S., *viz.,* to promote the study of Oriental Literature, I was determined to carry out here the two others. All know with what success this has been attended. Twice Colonel Olcott was asked to come over, and then I learned that I was once more wanted in India—at any rate by some. But the invitation came too late; neither would my doctor permit it, nor can I, if I would be true to my life-pledge and vows, now live at the Headquarters from which the Masters and Their spirit are virtually banished. The presence of Their portraits will not help; They are a dead letter. The truth is that I can never return to India in any other capacity than as Their faithful agent. And as, unless They appear among the Council *in propria persona* (which They will certainly never do now), no advice of mine on occult lines seems likely to be accepted, as the fact of my relations with the Masters is doubted, even totally denied by some; and I myself having no right to the Headquarters, what reason is there, therefore, for me to live at Adyar?

The fact is this: In my position, half-measures are worse than none. People have either to believe entirely in me, or to *honestly* disbelieve. No one, no Theosophist, is compelled to be-

lieve, but it is worse than useless for people to ask me to help them, if they do not believe in me. Here in Europe and America are many who have never flinched in their devotion to Theosophy; consequently the spread of Theosophy and of the T.S., in the West, during the last three years, has been extraordinary. The chief reason for this is that I was enabled and encouraged by the devotion of an ever-increasing number of members to the Cause and to Those who guide it, to establish an Esoteric Section, in which I can teach something of what I have learned to those who have confidence in me, and who prove this confidence by their disinterested work for Theosophy and the T. S. For the future, then, it is my intention to devote my life and energy to the E. S., and to the teaching of those whose confidence I retain. It is useless that I should use the little time I have before me to justify myself before those who do not feel sure about the real existence of the Masters, only because, misunderstanding me, it therefore suits them to suspect me.

And let me say at once, to avoid misconception, that my only reason for accepting the exoteric direction of European affairs, was to save those who really have Theosophy at heart and work for it and the Society, from being hampered by those who not only do not care for Theosophy, as laid out by the Masters, but are entirely working against both, endeavouring to undermine and counteract the influence of the good work done, both by open denial of the existence of the Masters, by declared and bitter hostility to myself, and also by joining forces with the most desperate enemies of our Society.

Half-measures, I repeat, are no longer possible. Either I have stated the truth as I know it about the Masters, and teach what I have been taught by them, or I have invented both Them and the Esoteric Philosophy. There are those among the Esotericists of the inner group who say that if I have done the latter, then I must myself be a "Master." However it may be, there is no alternative to this dilemma.

The only claim, therefore, which India could ever have upon me would be strong only in proportion to the activity of the Fellows there for Theosophy and their loyalty to the Masters. You should not need my presence among you to convince you of the truth of Theosophy, any more than your American brothers need it. A conviction that wanes when any particular personality is absent is no conviction at all. Know, moreover, that any further proof and teaching I can give only to the Esoteric Section, and

this for the following reason: its members are the only ones whom I have the right to expel for open disloyalty to their pledge *(not to me,* H.P.B., but to their *Higher Self* and the *Mahatmic aspect of the Masters*), a privilege I cannot exercise with F. T. S.'s at large, yet one which is the only means of cutting off a diseased limb from the healthy body of the Tree, and thus save it from infection. I can care only for those who cannot be swayed by every breath of calumny, and every sneer, suspicion, or criticism, whomsoever it may emanate from.

Thenceforth let it be clearly understood that the rest of my life is devoted only to those who believe in the Masters, and are willing to work for Theosophy as They understand it, and for the T. S. on the lines upon which They originally established it.

If, then, my Hindu brothers really and earnestly desire to bring about the regeneration of India, if they wish to ever bring back the days when the Masters, in the ages of India's ancient glory, came freely among them, guiding and teaching the peoples; then let them cast aside all fear and hesitation, and turn a new leaf in the history of the Theosophical Movement. Let them bravely rally around the President-Founder, whether I am in India or not, as around those few true Theosophists who have remained loyal throughout, and bid defiance to all calumniators and ambitious malcontents—both without and within the Theosophical Society.

H. P. Blavatsky

A Condition of Yoga

One of the conditions of Yoga is seclusion in a place where the Yogi is free from all impurities—whether physical or moral. In short, he must get away from the immoral atmosphere of the world. If anyone has by such study gained powers, he cannot remain long in the world without losing the greater part of his powers—and that the higher and nobler part. So that, if any such person is seen for many consecutive years labouring in public, and neither for money nor fame, it should be known that he is sacrificing himself for the good of his fellow-men. Some day such men seem to suddenly die, and their supposed remains are disposed of; but yet they may not be dead. "Appearances are deceitful," as the proverb says. —H.P.B.

The Theosophist, February, 1881

STUDIES IN KARMA

The Karma of Calumny

> Over the gateway of Century I of our era, the ominous words "the Karma of Israel," fatally glowed. Over the portals of our own, the future seer may discern other words, that will point to the Karma for cunningly made-up History, for events purposely perverted, and for great characters slandered by posterity, mangled out of recognition. . . . (*Secret Doctrine,* 1888, xli.)

IN the long struggle of Man against his own salvation, the Spirit has but one weapon—Truth. The animal in man has a thousand, adapted in turn to the varying modes of the times. In one, it is the horror of excommunication and the fear of hell; in another, the sword; or the rack or faggot. Our age is ill-adapted to the use of fire and sword against philosophy; ridicule, slander, calumny, the keener horrors of moral persecution, are better fitted.

Theosophists have more cause than most men to study this weaponry. The issue is supreme; never in any age has so much depended on so few. It is not easily that materialistic vested interests, whose very existence depends upon the retardation of the true course of evolution, will surrender Man to the Light of his own spirit. Many times in the past have we seen the recrudescent struggle on the plane of glaring slander and fabricated scandal. 'The enemy *cannot attack the philosophy of Theosophy as such, since to do so would be to describe it and thus to propagate it.* But to single out striking personalities, ascribing to them lurid sins, or common vices brought to depths all too easily understood by the mind of the age: this is easy. No effort is required to understand *that.* The strategy is obvious; and it is excellent, if, for instance, a reactionary religious organization wishes to render less effective the influence of Theosophical ideas.

Clearly, few men can read hundreds of pages of calumny against H. P. Blavatsky, and at the same time study her works with philosophic calm; yet the study of those works is the only final authority that a man may find as to the truth of her life. The object of calumny would appear to be to prevent investigation of Theosophy; or, failing in this, to see that the victim approaches Theosophy with an incurable prejudice implanted in his mind. The test of Theosophy is not in the character of H.P.B.: the test of her character is in Theosophy. But no pre-poisoned mind can easily understand the latter. What kind of woman wrote the works of H.P.B.? How can a man understand that if he cannot understand the works?

Yet Theosophy today suffers less from such obviously motivated attacks than from irresponsible sensation- and gossip-seeking. By this peculiar means, old vilifications, *once planned as strategy,* can be made much more creditable by the apparent disinterestedness of the tabloid-tending story-teller. That vicious tales are eagerly sought by publishers and public but signifies the gradually extending base upon which the "karma of calumny" will, in return cycle, render *all* truths obscure.

What is the karma of calumny? That is a mighty question. Not the karma, personally considered, of Theosophists; unless by feebleness of their own knowledge their roots are loose in the truth and their limbs weak to quiver in such foul winds; or unless they have, despite the warnings not to look for results, pinned their hopes on the saving of *this* generation of man—a saving which we have long been warned is of doubtful accomplishment. It is the karma of the race. Men cannot fall victims to self-exposing calumnies if their minds are clean, and eager only for truth. Rather, their very sense of justice, if active at all, is but aroused to seek for the full tale of the other side. In no case can harm through calumny come to any man who has not already so harmed himself.

But indeed it is an evil age when calumny can be written, published, and read at all as "literature," except in stern skepticism and comparison. The evil sweeps far and lies deep. The *Secret Doctrine* statement on the karma of perverting "history" is a grim indication that the gigantic ill of these times—even the possible on-sweeping doom of the whole "cultural" complex—is rooted in lie and libel. The popular lust for derogation is of a kind with the sadism that so eagerly devours the daily tale of accident and murder, and gloats upon the battered ruin of the prize-fighter's face.

Both lies and libels are expressed fears—the first, fear of *abstract* truth; the second, fear (issuing in dislike and resentment) of another's moral superiority, that is, of *truth* embodied in human character. The karma of fear, in this case, takes the form of a *preference* for distortion. One who distorts truth in his own mind is corrupting himself, not truth: it is only a question of time before he creates an inner demon that rejoices at every opportunity to promote damage to another's physical person (sadism); or to destroy, in some measure, his psychic adjustment with society (slander).

Distortion of truth in individual relationships is the root from which grows the familiar forest of expedient political policy—the lies of state. This renders more comprehensible the sequence of events depending upon Bismarck's falsification of the Ems telegram,

which led to the war of 1870, which led to the war of 1914, which led to the war of 1939, which may lead . . . where? It was not altogether that single deed: the whole story is one of a widening, growing stream of falsehood converging from the dark canyons of nationalism.

But let us first—with some little aid from modern psychiatry—explore the smaller crevices of our own souls, and test the fluids rising from their depths; for do not these flow into and compose the greater torrent of the race mind?

Calumny will be seen to exist in several degrees of guilt, like the physical slaying of which it is the moral counterpart. Let us understand this, lest, in our turn, we calumniate the calumniator. Least culpable is the "pathological liar" to whom truth and the random fancies of his own mind are truly indistinguishable—the condition of the imaginative child who has never grown up. Such persons all unwittingly become at times lusty slanderers, but their "defect of nature" corresponds to the insanity which rescues the murdered from the gallows. They are irresponsible, because unconscious, mediums: the astral light, ever pressing upon their susceptible minds, causes images of sin and crime to rise effortlessly in colorful presentations. Receptive also in the extreme, these vivid imaginations set off in hue and cry after every suggestion, elaborating ad infinitum and often with the greatest verisimilitude.

Have we ever listened in a lawyer's office to highly detailed, earnestly presented particulars, alleged to be eyewitnessed, of infamies charged against some unhappy defendant; deeds which could not possibly have occurred under the circumstances? Did we notice that the "witness" believed all of it; and believing it, would have been a most convincing witness to an uninformed jury, if his true nature had not been quickly recognized by the lawyer for the defendant.

The pathological liar is one kind of "psychic"; exemplar of the karma of a false "yoga" that has in some previous life destroyed the power of delineation between planes of perception, between images of reality, and self-imaginings. The ultimate responsibility of the soul of such a one is deep, and terrible; of the present personality, little or none. The trail of the pathological liar, once the traits of the type are known, is clearly discernible throughout the history of the Theosophical Movement; all the way from fervent belief in imaginary visits of "Masters" and romantic past incarnations, to the vilest of slanders. And in that wide field of credulous hearers and irresponsible gossips, no cautious judges or experienced lawyers stand on guard to protect the innocent victim!

Next in ascent of guilt, come—ourselves. Ourselves, the purveyor of the casual quip, the "wise crack," of petty gossip; we, the sewing circle assassin; the bridge table terrorist.

The sources of the satisfactions arising from malicious gossip are being well enough established by modern psychiatry; they were well known to theosophists long before, even though in one school the responsible force is called the "kama" and in the other the "id." The random calumniator can be absolved from the karma of the more magnificent forms of character slaughter in that he has no real animus against his victims; one will do as well as another to satisfy his hunger for self-esteem. The "inferiority complex" must relieve itself by achievement—achievement in nihilism in the case of a Hitler—or by pulling down the rest of the world to the same inferior level.

Next in line of ascending guilt we may logically place the fanatic—religious or otherwise—to whom the cause of the enemy is the cause of the Devil; an adversary against whom only hell-fire may prevail, any means of victory being thus justified. Nothing is too brutal to be believed and said against a religious opponent—as theosophists well know; nor does the situation differ in politics, albeit the slings and arrows of the lie are there directed as a rule against hides well-armored with old scar tissue.

The cause of Theosophy—or say rather the cause of those who might have benefitted by it but were turned away—has suffered most from the righteous slanderer; in which history it stands side by side with many a great man of the past—Paine, for instance.

Finally, a special place must be reserved for the slanderer for a profit; the professional writer who, rising from one butchered reputation, calmly casts about for another, plump for slaughter and weakly defended—especially defenseless if the owner thereof is long dead.

H. P. Blavatsky herself said it long ago, with more dignity than we command, in casting her gauntlet to the cynical world and rendering thereto the salutation of her doomed repute:

> The mercenaries and parasites of the Press, who prostitute its more than royal power, and dishonor a noble profession, will find it easy to mock at things too wonderful for them to understand; for to them the price of a paragraph is more than the value of sincerity. From many will come honest criticism; from many—cant. But we look to the future.
>
> The contest now going on between the party of public conscience and the party of reaction, has already developed a healthier tone of thought. It will hardly fail to result ultimately in the overthrow of

> error and the triumph of Truth. We repeat again—we are laboring for the brighter morrow.
>
> And yet, when we consider the bitter opposition that we are called upon to face, who is better entitled than we upon entering the arena to write upon our shield the hail of the Roman gladiator to Caesar: MORITURUS TE SALUTAT! (New York, September, 1877. *Isis Unveiled,* viii.)

Since her day, and following H.P.B.'s own injunction, much has been written in the attempt to unravel the tangled ways into which the bewildered will of man throws the simple but irresistible power of Karmic Law. A neglected phase—for quantitative data are lacking—is the mathematical relation between a little and ignoble motive and the gigantic misdeed that may be its cumulative result. That thousands standing at the impalpable apex of their final choice for good or evil, may be lured into the abyss by a clever collection of vulgar misrepresentations, assembled in order that a writer may replenish a purse; that a civilization hanging over the abyss may have its last life-line cut by facile scissors clipping scandal—what words in reality could command a description of the future of such a one? He who has truly experienced in full the retributive weight by which the Law purges a deep sin, knows that the truth will be avenged—but alas, knows also the ghastly emptiness of vengeance.

It can be shown that calumny can and does lead to every kind of individual human misery and disaster as it grows through the peoples and through the years; that it can destroy the repute of nations as of individuals, setting man against man unto the ultimate of mass murder; that it can smother and cloud all knowledge that may save, and in the end blast civilizations out of existence. And why not? For it is the direct expression, the active aspect of the Great Illusion—the Maya of matter; its blinding obfuscations Mara's very veil. Involving every disaster, it must involve every penalty. As the great island is built by the multitudinous efforts of the coral insect, so the great disasters of religious and national ignorances and hatreds are builded by the indefatigable efforts of those of us who yield day by day to the petty temptation of the malicious thought, the slurring word.

This cheap chatter in which all indulge upon occasion, is most subtle in its erosion of character. The habit tends to grow; if allowed to mature, in time our friends sense that in us which is to be distrusted. The inner life of achievement and right intent can be replaced by degrees with mere derogation and contempt of others, as the fibre of the good wood is replaced unseen by the dry-rot

fungus. In the course of time we may find ourselves among those who even find livelihood by skill in scandal, parasitic upon the spiritual life-blood of the race.

Falsity is a theft from truth. The man who lives by theft in time disbelieves all honesty; with loss of discrimination comes inability to tell friend from foe; hence with loss of discrimination, loss of all. So with the thief of truth: the shell built between himself and the Spirit—which is embodied Truth of itself—grows impenetrable. The seeds sown—of bewilderment and darkness, sin and sorrow, of errancy and delayed evolution—ripen and are reaped. In the end, the deserted self cries in anguish for aid, for light; and from all the Universe comes no pitying echo, nor any faintest gleam of dawn.

Upon that dread excursion from the path stray all our feet from time to time. When our Cause is wounded by the lying tongue, let us, then, look to ourselves.

> . . . great characters [are] slandered by posterity, mangled out of recognition, between the two cars of Jagannatha—Bigotry and Materialism; one accepting too much, the other denying all. Wise is he who holds to the golden mid-point, who believes in the eternal justice of things.

The Silent Helpers

There are very few persons in [India], who, being in search of the ancient Aryan Philosophy, have obtained control over the bodily passions which trouble ordinary men beyond measure. Fewer still who like one now living in India, whom I dare not mention, are known. Almost all who have thoroughly studied or are studying that ennobling philosophy, keep themselves out of the public view in compliance with wise and inexorable rules. It is not through selfishness, as too many imagine. Though unseen, they none the less are continually working for the good of humanity. In thousands of cases what they effect is ascribed to Providence. And whenever they find anyone who, like themselves, has an ambition above the mere pleasures of this world, and is in search of that Vidya which alone can make man wise in this as well as happy in the next, they stand ready by his side, take him up in their hands as soon as he shows his worthiness, and put in his way the opportunities to learn that philosophy, the study of which has made them masters of themselves, of nature's forces, and of this world. —D.K.M.

The Theosophist, January, 1880

PRACTICAL METAPHYSICS

V: The Matter of Becoming

EVOLUTION, it is often correctly asserted, means conflict. But this conflict need not be considered blind opposition of different types of force and intelligence. Herbert Spencer defined the essence of life as the "continued adjustment of internal relations to external relations" and the "continuous adjustment of external relations to internal relations." The external relations of the individual, as the man of mind, include most specifically the "animal" world of sensations, appetites, etc., and the mental complexes developed by mankind from the mingling of the physical and mental fields of action.

Evolution for man means assimilation, the reaching of a wider perspective which alters his relation of values. For the man of mind to assimilate the energies, tendencies and desires of "physical" nature means a double accomplishment of evolution—evolution for the man of mind and also evolution for those centers of energy and intelligence called animal instinct, for they are re-directed and consciously woven into a new pattern.

Duality in the nature of man seems a natural conclusion, and the study of the varying struggles between the two contradictorily inclined facets of the human being should belong to the field of psychology. Unfortunately, however, the majority of modern psychology's proponents are monists rather than dualists, though their ultimate "reality" is physical matter rather than a "God" concept. On this tendency to accept a "monism of matter," the great British metaphysician, McTaggart, has this to say:

> There is a very strong tendency to adopt the view that the self is a mere activity of the body—or at any rate, to hold that the only escape from this view lies in accepting some form of revealed religion which denies it. . . .
>
> Monism then, whether it be materialism or idealism, is more attractive to the majority of inquirers than dualism is. Now the effects of body on mind and of mind on body could be explained on the hypothesis that the self and the body were two separate realities, neither of which was the mere product of the other, though each affected the other, and caused changes in it. And it might be thought that this would be the most natural conclusion to adopt, since the action appears to be reciprocal—mind acting on body as much as body acts on mind. (*Some Dogmas of Religion*, pp. 80-81.)

It may be worthwhile, then, to turn to those philosophers and psychologists who proceeded from the assumption of a natural and real duality in man, even though some of the best representatives of this view are among the ancients. Plato based his psychology and philosophy upon such a duality, the *nous* or rational soul, and the *psyche* or irrational soul. For Plato it is the *psyche* or animal intelligence which makes for confusion in thought. He held that men have not yet learned to distinguish and assimilate the nature of animal influences and hence see only the confused reflection of a potentially clear mental vision. ("The Cave," *Republic.*)

> Plato and Pythagoras [says Plutarch] distribute the soul into two parts, the rational and irrational; that part of the soul of man which is rational, is eternal; but that part of the soul which is divested of reason dies.

The immediate implications of this dualism are simple: men are essentially self-reliant as souls, and at the same time they have a responsibility to all those other forms of life which give the soul temporary vehicles of expression.

Once again to employ Emerson's phraseology in expressing what he terms this "secret of nature":

> All goes to show that the soul in man is not an organ, but animates and exercises all the organs; is not a function, like the power of memory, of calculation, of comparison,—but uses these as hands and feet; is not a faculty, but a light; is not the intellect or the will, but the master of the intellect and the will;—is the vast background of our being, in which they lie. (Essay, "The Over-Soul.")

To thus describe soul philosophically is neither to enter the usual provinces of religious definitions, nor to forsake religion entirely. We simply find ourselves saying that man is essentially an ensouling intelligence within the material instruments he uses. On this view he does not *have* a soul, however, which may be saved or lost. Rather, he *is* a soul or self, living in and yet not ultimately conditioned by the motions of matter.

And what of "matter" itself? Its formation in the tree, the animal, or human body denotes adaptive intelligence. Where and how do we draw the distinction between the "soul" of man and the "ensouling" intelligence of other forms of life? Both express the capacity to become more than they already are. Man becomes more than he already is by "conscious choice." Lower orders of nature seem to represent a form or type of species

intelligence, and to evolve through some inner, unconscious unfolding. Perhaps this is intelligence not yet become self-conscious, although fundamentally akin to ours in its capacity to "become." This view introduces us to a very profound though ancient group of Asiatic and Hindu wise men who philosophically built the bridge between man, animal, and plant by saying, in effect, that *all* is soul and spirit, ever evolving. So said Laotze, Buddha and Sankara. And in the Western world, so also did Leibnitz try to say it. He gave us a useful word—monad.

MacNeile Dixon shows how this word may be used to offer us a new wider view of evolution:

> If in the attempt to account for things as they are I have to choose between atoms and living monads, I have not a moment's hesitation. I choose the latter. . . . They do not belong, the monads, to the corporeal world, and are themselves, indeed, transcendent and unrepresentable as entities, or substances occupying space, in which region they are but partially represented. . . . A single soul or self sums up—since no two are alike, as no two flowers in nature are alike, and since their mode of existence is hidden from us—the whole unfathomed mystery of things. We may conclude, then, that mind is ultimate, and the cosmic system a manifestation of many minds. . . . And now consider further the society of selves or monads we have pictured. It is composed of lesser societies or partnerships, the communities or associations of sympathetic entities. Monads of the same level congregate or draw together. They seek and find, as in the elements, their natural homes, forming throughout the realm of nature as in minerals, plants and animals, a great variety of groups and federations. . . . On this conception, the Cosmos is "a vast and complex web of life," a concourse or colony of creatures, for each of whom its environment, or forum of activities, is just the rest of the society. It is a hierachy of innumerable minds, an ascending series of intelligences. They have made, as it were . . . an adjustment and equilibrium, such as, despite its convulsions and disharmonies, appear in the regularity and uniformity, the stability and order of nature that we call her laws.

This offers a new perspective on evolution. Evolution has real meaning to the individual only to the degree that it suggests purpose. He can truly believe in his own attempts to become something more than he already is only if this aspiration somehow fits into a larger scheme of things. To fit himself into the general scheme he must establish some form of inter-relatedness between his own "becoming" and that of every other form of adaptive life. Only then can he fully reconcile himself with nature, feel at home amidst the cross-currents of conflicting moral and animal desires.

The philosophy implicit in a concept of the monad establishes a full inter-relatedness. Man, on this view, is afloat in a vast sea, composed of like units of evolving intelligence. But he is not afloat without a compass.

Every human being has his own part in a cooperative enterprise. He perceives a kinship with forms of intelligence less evolved than himself, as well as with higher beings who can aid him in his evolution. All are members of one fraternity, representing different degrees of intuitive perception. In this perspective, religious differences melt away, for must not religious teachers and philosophers be linked in the same knowledge? There is and can be in truth only one religion, which is subject, however, to partially correct interpretations and misinterpretations. Racial and class differences also disintegrate before the mind, for man discovers a growing relationship and a relationship of growth between himself and all his fellows.

Every form of life is both Being and Becoming. Evolution in its totality is an infinite Becoming. Both Being and Becoming are without conceivable beginning or imaginable end. Life, therefore, has infinite possibilities, and man comes to feel a "share in eternity." He is a part of the whole, a whole that he can understand, at least in general terms of an endless process of unfoldment. His purpose in living is the purpose of learning by establishment of mutually helpful relationships with all other forms of life. He is determining the outcome of the life-voyage by his thoughts and actions, by the unfolding of the infinite capacities which he represents. It is neither a voyage upon which men were sent by an external God, nor yet a senseless and purposeless voyage of atoms, coming from nowhere and having a similar destination.

In our investigation we have come to establish certain suggested points of reference: (1) The unity in Being of all things, the infinite diversity of Becoming. (2) The duality of man's nature, or the contemporaneous existence of a moral self and an amoral or animal self, composed of the instinctive units of intelligence which animate the body. (3) The existence of the soul or moral being as a self-conscious entity capable of extending its view of the interrelatedness of all things to the utmost confines of the universe. (4) The logical necessity of denying that the universe *has* any such confines, because each degree of monadic life is neither highest nor lowest. (5) The lower *becomes* the higher. Man is self-conscious, for instance, yet only to the degree that he knows

himself. He may be said to be on the journey to full self-consciousness, but he has not yet attained it. The most venerable and persistent of Eastern traditions, of course, proclaim the actual and real existence of beings, once ordinary men, who have attained full self-knowledge. Nor, of course, does this view violate the domain of reason. That great evolutionist of the last century, Prof. Thomas Huxley, once remarked "There must be beings in the universe whose intelligence is as much beyond ours as ours exceeds that of the black beetle."

All of which suggests that if there indeed be manifestations of higher powers than man's in nature—and many seem instinctively to so believe—they can logically be regarded as emanating from a host of "Gods," a collectivity, rather than from a single anthropomorphic source. The ancient lore concerning "Gods who walked the earth," for instance, the Hindu tradition of Mahatmas —these are not impossible thoughts. For the view of self-induced evolution we have developed suggests a reasonable relationship between men and Gods. If there are "Gods," they were once men. If there are "Gods," men can also achieve their status.

MacNeile Dixon closes his *Human Situation* with this paragraph:

> What a handful of dust is man to think such thoughts! Or is he, perchance, a prince in misfortune, whose speech at times betrays his birth? I like to think that, if men are machines, they are machines of a celestial pattern, which can rise above themselves, and, to the amazement of the watching gods, acquit themselves as men. I like to think that this singular race of indomitable, philosophising, poetical beings, resolute to carry the banner of Becoming to unimaginable heights, may be as interesting to the gods as they to us, and that they will stoop to admit these creatures of promise into their divine society.

Matter is the vehicle for the manifestation of soul on this plane of existence, and soul is the vehicle on a higher plane for the manifestation of spirit, and these three are a trinity synthesized by Life, which pervades them all. —H.P.B.

YOUTH-COMPANIONS AT HOME

ON Paul's watch, the luminous dial showed two o'clock. The house seemed dark and quiet as he opened the front door and slipped up the stairs, but a chink of light outlined the partially open door of Father's room. "What's up?" Paul muttered to himself, cocking an eye at the ceiling, although there was no one around to appreciate the by-play. "It's long past *Dad's* bedtime." Father, opening the door just then, answered Paul's unspoken question with an easy smile.

"I've been waiting for you, son."

Paul colored, and, restraining a sharp retort, replied, "That was hardly necessary, Dad. I'm old enough to take care of myself, you know."

"Of course," Father acquiesced agreeably. "I wasn't worried about you—just curious. When you said you were going out to have a talk with Bill, and three, four, and finally five hours went by before you'd finished talking, I found myself getting more and more interested in what you could possibly be saying that would take that long. —Not that I'm asking you to tell me. Simply curious, as I say. I'm continually surprised at how much people can find to talk about."

"Even if you wanted to know, I couldn't tell you all we talked about if I took the rest of the night," Paul said. "Almost everything, I guess."

Father nodded, and turned quietly away. He had provided the opportunity for Paul to acquaint him with the situation, and his manner suggested that he would do no more. Paul, sensing no constraint in Father's concern, now felt impelled to speak.

"Say, Dad," he began, "I *would* like to tell you more about it. The fact is, Bill's pretty badly shaken up and confused right now, and I was trying to help him."

"Do you think you succeeded?" Father asked, maintaining his detachment. Paul took an instant out to mentally appreciate the fact that Father made no attempt to pursue an inquiry into Bill's private affairs.

"Yes," said Paul, "I think I did."

"Did Bill say so himself?" Father asked.

"No."

"That's good," said Father, rather unexpectedly. Seeing the puzzled look on Paul's face, he added:

"Perhaps I can make clear what I feel about talk-fests on personal matters, son. To start with, they seem to be all tied up

with the latest craze for irresponsible babblings—to a psychoanalyst, now, instead of to a priest. But everybody appears anxious to show what a complex individual he is, to pour out his inmost thoughts, his most personal and private concerns to anybody.

"This isn't aimed at you, Paul," Father hastened to say. "Bill doesn't consider you 'just anyone,' I'm sure. But I'm glad he wasn't looking for a mentor. I don't think much of this habit of 'shopping around' for advice—and we both know that you're not old enough nor wise enough to give it."

Father sat down on the edge of his bed and began filling his pipe, an indication that Paul could have a chance to talk now.

"Well, then," Paul began, swinging his legs over the arm of a chair so that he half-faced his father, "You won't be glad to hear that Bill *did* seek me out, quite deliberately, to ask me what I thought about several things—but I wouldn't say it was to ask 'advice.' That sounds as if Bill has a religious outlook, which is by no means true. He thought simply hearing my ideas might give him some new angles, and that would help him. He isn't the kind that just has to 'let off steam.' He wanted help in figuring out some things. I don't think it's being conceited," he finished, "to say that I think I *did* help him."

"Oh," said Father, and carefully lit his pipe.

Paul preserved silence.

"And how does it feel to be helping people, eh?" There was a trace of annoyance in Father's voice, for he is a simple man, and has small patience with any intellectual affectation.

Paul did not alleviate his father's annoyance by asking with a studied innocence, "What's the matter, Dad? Don't you want me to help people if I can?"

"From the little I know about it," Father replied, "it takes more than a college education and a year or two of experience in the great wide world to be able to help people. If I might dispense some unsolicited words of homespun wisdom, let me suggest that the best help you can give anyone is not in the nature of advice. Even Buddha didn't spend five hours expounding philosophy to Kisagotami. He simply told her to get some mustard seeds from a house death had never visited—and she began to find the answer to that most difficult and universal problem, *for herself.*"

"That may be," returned Paul, stubbornly. "But there are some things that I've figured out pretty thoroughly, and if they can be of any assistance to anyone else, I think I'm obligated to talk about them."

"Are you so certain that your formulations are the right ones for someone else?" Father persisted. "Couldn't you let him figure them out for himself?" he added, a three-o'clock-in-the-morning weariness showing in his roughened voice. "Remember that the honest and the only effective teacher is the one who tries to minimize his own superiority, and bring out that of others. I'm hoping that you'll get to that stage a little quicker than most, that's all."

Paul swung his feet down on the floor with a thump and leaned forward to face his father.

"I don't want to 'get over' the stage of trying to help people," he said, slowly. "When you've done that, you've managed to cut yourself off from other people, and I don't see that as the object of evolution. If there are some people I can help in certain ways, I don't see why it's conceit to recognize the fact."

Father rumpled his hair in obvious vexation. There were times, he thought grimly, when he was tempted to dispense with tact.

"Look here, Paul," he began again. "What I'm trying to say is that I think it is very easy to get into a dangerous position. Some people talk about having a 'mission,' for instance. And yet, they are not so much interested in fulfilling the mission, as in persuading other people to adopt it as *their* mission also. By trying, no matter how subtly, to guide and direct other people, we become involved in their Karma—and we seldom appreciate how far our responsibility goes in such a case."

"I'm not afraid of taking the responsibility for any of the things I expressed my opinion on," rejoined Paul, imperturbably. "As a matter of fact, I think I made a number of pretty good suggestions."

"*Suggestions* are all right. But my point is, don't you see, that you can't say your responsibility starts here and ends there, when you've constituted yourself a kind of spiritual *adviser?* It's not a question of anyone's wanting to avoid the consequences of advice he has given—he won't be able to. And when he finally sees them, it'll be too late to wish they weren't there. The wise do not involve themselves in the problems of others, but know how to assemble the *factors* involved. When all the factors are evident, the individual decides for himself."

Father's tone was unmistakable, and Paul was unmistakably impressed. Father, however, was not one to overplay a point.

"Well, son," he said, "you can go on from here. That's all the 'advice' I have to give you. —Besides, that clock is giving out the best advice for both of us right now."

THE KINGLY MYSTERY

IN every branch of human experience, there is a kingly art, a kingly code, which is as far beyond the ordinary as the sun exceeds in brilliance the feeble rays of the arc-lamp. This kingly science, unfortunately, is not known today, so that the men of our time remain satisfied with superficial life. We spend many years of labored study in the search of knowledge. We bend all effort toward the pursuit of happiness, which we hold to be the inalienable right of man. Yet, where is the person who has reached to even a fraction of the possible in either? Our knowledge, for the most part, is mere information, a paltry acquaintance with what other people have said or written; our happiness, a temporary respite from what we call the grim realities of life; our devotion, a waste of energy upon changing ideals. In no single field of endeavor have we even approached the real and enduring that lies behind all experience. The kingly mystery is unrecognized, unknown.

So accustomed is the man of our time to living in the material world that he measures all experience in material terms. Sacrifice is weighed in terms of dollars or sovereigns; devotion and effort in terms of results achieved. Knowledge is measured by one's ability to recite information.

Yet, is it not clear to anyone who thinks that mere information is not knowledge? That form of learning which concerns itself solely with externals is as faulty and unstable as the shifting sands of the desert. In times of crisis the purely intellectual person finds himself bankrupt. He has squandered his mental resources upon unstable values. He has no store of principles.

The common understanding of the term "happiness" is just as materialistic. For the most part, it implies the presence of some external object or condition in which one finds delight. As long as conditions and events arrange themselves according to our desires, we are happy. But when these conditions change, as all outer forms eventually must, where is happiness? Gone as quickly as it came, and one finds himself in a slough of despond corresponding in depth to the height of his previous exaltation.

The Western mind finds difficulty perhaps in grasping the idea of a happiness that does not depend upon external things or conditions. We fail to understand that there is a place wherein knowledge is experienced without the usual methods of reasoning. We cannot comprehend the idea of devotion to the Self of All as the first key to knowledge.

The kingly science suggests that knowledge, happiness and devotion are *inherent* in the one who perceives—and not in the objects perceived. All true experience is *inner* experience—the outer form or event being the mere body or vehicle of expression. In the performance of sacrifice, for example, the performance is not the real: the real is the sacrifice. In deeds of charity, the deeds are not the real: the real is the charity. In the giving of gifts, the gift is not the real: the giving becomes the gift. Thus are transmitted the heart qualities of the giver.

But without someone to receive, there could be no giving. And little do we realize ordinarily that any qualities are required of the recipient. A man is truly benefited by a gift only when there is kindled in him something of the heart quality of his benefactor. His need has been his opportunity for the awakening in him of gratitude, humility, and a heightened perception of the meaning of life. Ingratitude is a crime in Occultism. One who is guilty of it not only closes the channels for the transmission of spiritual force from benefactor to recipient, but he also retards the revolution of the Great Wheel of Reciprocity in Nature that we call Brotherhood.

Consider further the example of devotion, or the expenditure of energy in support of any worthy cause. There, too, success or failure is to be found not in the seeming results achieved on the outer plane. The real value of any work done, in the light of the kingly science, is something which relates to the inner man, is there recorded, and has nought to do with conventional standards of success. Similarly, with regard to the kingly science as applied to all forms of experience. It is an inner position assumed which determines all values, for then the qualities of Soul come into expression as a kingly art.

The first step in the acquirement of knowledge is a recognition of the reality of the Supreme Spirit. One indivisible, homogeneous Essence pervades the entire universe. Being infinite and omnipresent, no object or being can escape Its presence. To realize inwardly this Divine Presence—a feat held by mystics to be entirely possible—is to have identified one's consciousness with the Real in everything. Using this unconditioned Homogeneity as a point of departure, the Sage proceeds in his investigation of things and beings, and may know whatever he desires without the customary processes of reasoning. He knows by *becoming* the thing he desires to know. He sees from within outwardly, and thus may apprehend all the properties of stone or metal, or discern what

goes on in the mind of insect or animal. He reads with ease the hearts of men.

To embody this higher wisdom does not mean that one falls away from his friends, that he no longer finds joy in the simple pleasures of human life. He does not cast to the wind the knowledge gained by modern science. He is drawn closer to his friends and finds more joy than ever in the sweet pleasures of life. From the vantage point of the kingly science, he sees all in their relations in the great fitness of all things. He ensouls the facts of science with moral values and gives to them a meaning which they never had before. Thus does he enrich life and gain riches for himself.

Taking the position of Soul, and realizing more fully the nature of the Supreme, there wells up within a knowledge of the mystery of the kingly science. "He who possesseth it goeth no more astray."

"Terra Incognita"

If we were to attempt to solve the mystery of the "Sphinx of the nineteenth century" and give a history about the true *Ego* of H. P. Blavatsky, we would first of all have to learn who is the individuality, the "new creature" (*Gal.* vi. 15) that was embodied in the form of H.P.B., and know something of its previous lives, so as to be able to understand what caused it to appear in a woman's form upon this earth. We would then have to accept the theory that the soul of the regenerated is capable of living and acting beyond the limits of the physical form which is its dwelling and instrument for outward manifestation, and that the spiritual soul of such a person may be in an ethereal astral form in some distant country—say in Tibet—while the physical body is still living and acting consciously and intelligently in Europe and America. But the world is not yet ripe enough to receive a serious history, containing facts which are still a *terra incognita* to Europe and science. . . . Such a history would require readers acquainted with *Reincarnation* and *Karma;* readers that had themselves conquered their own nature, and . . . had been enabled to realize what it means to be in the world but not of it. * * *

To understand the true mystery that surrounded H.P.B., it will first be necessary to understand the mystery called "Man": for the Initiate, compared with the vulgar, is like a bird in comparison with an egg. . . . To solve the great mystery called man, mankind will have to crawl out of the "philosophical egg" and, by becoming free, attain the noble self-knowledge of Divinity in Humanity. —*Lucifer,* July, 1891

EVERYDAY QUESTIONS

On Patanjali's Yoga Aphorisms

APHORISM 9 (Book II): *I can not see how* any *basic drive of human life could be felt by the* wise *as by the unwise. I can not believe that* the wise *could possibly be held in a worn-out body so long as are, or have been, the unwise. What is the relation between Tanha and Skandhas?*

The "wise" man is the man who has gradually established sympathetic understanding with every form of intelligence—including the "lower" as well as the "higher." It is the nature of purely psychophysical intelligence to focus nearly all energy upon the continuance of existence, because that particular organic complex can only be enlightened by higher intelligence so long as it shall live. This is the *physical* instinct for preservation, and it is normal and beneficial. The "wise" man not only "feels" this, as it exists in his own physical instrument—he will feel it more keenly than anyone else, because he is more understanding and sympathetic toward "life" in particular and as a whole. Nor will he sacrifice the body lightly. The difference between the wise and the unwise in respect to "thirst for life" lies in the fact that the wise are not *subject* to this feeling—they simply *feel* it, whereas the unwise, possessing "misconceptions of duties and responsibilities" allow the feelings of the body to eclipse the needs of the soul. No wise man is completely indifferent to the matter of preserving his life upon earth—the suicides are not the "wise" but those so tragically confused that they *feel nothing* with clarity. There is more than considerable difference between an ability to detach oneself, when necessary, from a feeling, and the tamasic state of living in an indifferent stupor in regard to all feelings. Physical "Tanha" can be very properly expressed as physical dynamism and intensity, without developing the skandhas which signify *fear* of death or any other ignoble physical cravenness.

Yet just as death should not be feared, but rather respected, so should life not be feared. The wise man is the man possessed of a maximum of intensity on every plane: he should be distinguished by his deeper appreciation of every form of beauty, for instance, including the beauty and magic of physical vitality.

Aphorism 16: (a) Do our imaginations and fears for the future cause any injury to the soul, other than waste of time and energy?

(b) Is Mr. Crosbie's statement on page 85 of The Friendly Philosopher, *"I used to look calmly and dispassionately at the*

very worst picture I could conjure up as happening to myself," etc., to be regarded as contradictory to this Aphorism?

(a) For man as Kshatriya or actor, there are two realities. The present moment is real, and eternal verities are real. Fear, as Patanjali endeavors to show, is invariably rooted in "illusion," a realm between the Present and the Eternal. No one fears the *present* moment, but fears instead moments not yet come. All that he may *do* in any moment is act, and while he acts there is room within his consciousness only for action and not for fear. Nor can anyone fear anything measured against the infinite background of eternity. Neither the moment nor eternity relate themselves to the countless numbers of "uncertain desires" which crowd the human mind. Uncertain desires relate only to an illusory sense of time, whereas *now,* the sphere of action, is an ultimate reality.

Fear distorts human relationships, for emotionalism renders potential philosophical attitudes inoperative. If a situation we have feared confronts us, we view it not as it actually is, but as warped by our fright and fancy. Thus fears alter the being himself so far as his existence as an effective center of action is concerned, and constantly affect all others with whom he comes in contact. For the evolving ego this alteration of psychic condition is a very specific injury, for it is a limitation on growth. His own karmic "circle of necessity" becomes more complicated, since the conditioning effect of his fears blocks any natural or balanced working out of his destiny. He is sundered, disparted, acts in hesitant fragmentary fashion, and therefore reaps fragmentary, confusing karma.

Patanjali's "meditation" is a term for the internal acts which establish a true relationship between the individual student and the events and beings that become relevant to his own soul pilgrimage. This, Patanjali suggests, is accomplished by excluding from meditation the confused feelings which comprise the innumerable conflicts of mind on matters not presently resolvable. The practice of mental discipline leads to the attainment of philosophy, and philosophy is to be judged in turn by action—by the degree to which it impels the individual to live fully in each moment while yet overshadowed by a sense of eternity.

(b) Robert Crosbie's statement seems clearly to be a way of laying fears to rest rather than a way of indulging in them by pre-occupation. This method in the strictest sense is a device

for dealing with any hidden fears that might lurk within the subconscious mind. As a device it is but one practical means to an end, and, like all devices, it should ultimately be dropped by the proper wayside. Any specific discipline must be transcended, however necessary it may once have been. If this particular practice were made a ritual for daily use it could lead to a psychological unbalance but one step removed from the original lurking worries. The hypochondriac is an example of one who misapplies the suggested method, for the hypochondriac often imagines the most dire physical happenings, while deriving secret pleasure from the fact that he really does not believe his actual situation will ever be "that bad." Such a distortion of the method would, however, be a way of trying to achieve a relative, external calmness by indulging in a specialized kind of *controlled* worry. Mr. Crosbie's intent was obviously to test the extent and nature of his *inner calmness*—and to better evaluate whatever final obstacles remained to bar its complete attainment.

Are not Aphorisms 23 and 24 somewhat contradictory? If "the conjuncture of the soul with the organ of thought, and thus with nature, is the cause of its apprehension of the actual condition of the nature of the Universe and of the soul itself," is this not highly desirable? If so, why should the cause of this conjuncture be quitted, as stated in Aphorism 24? And further, how can ignorance, cause of all the "afflictions," lead to such a noble result?

This question might be paraphrased: "Is evolution desirable, since one of the conditions of evolution is the incomplete knowledge of all the beings involved?" The English language seems lacking in appropriate terms to distinguish between evolution impelled by the trial and error process which accompanies ignorance, and completely self-directed evolution. The organ of thought is composed of the physical and the astral brains. These material foci are necessary as direct contact-points for the soul in journeying through those realms of experience which the simultaneous presence of myriads of differing classes of monads make possible for the soul. In the strictest sense the self-conscious man, or the monad, is not "ignorant," yet while in manifestation the man can not exhaust the infinite variety and significance of experience in the whole vast society of selves.

Obviously the word "ignorance" carries with it differing implications according to its context. In the most universal phil-

osophical sense it is simply the symbol of unfulfilled or uncompleted destiny—the impulsion to a further growth which may finally bring spiritual understanding. But ignorance is also a symbol for the degree to which the inertia of matter unnecessarily retards the widening of soul-perception. This "ignorance" ceases, says Patanjali, with the attainment of "perfect discriminative knowledge." "The isolation of the soul" mentioned in Aphorism 25 means that the soul is no longer confused or involved in acts of ignorance by the influence of matter. The soul sees *body as body* and *soul as soul,* and thus transcends the confusions of incarnation by reaping the benefits of learning *which only incarnation makes possible.*

Aphorism 34: Please clarify what is meant by "questionable things" in relation to motive and sins of omission.

"Questionable things" are simply those things done without sufficient concentration upon the possibility of doing something better. Any act is questionable not in itself, but in its relation to other acts which *might* be performed instead. Therefore all "wrong doing" is, in this sense, part of an "error of omission." As regards motive, the theosophical admonition that motive must be checked by mind, is once again a way of saying that no one can have a completely pure motive unless his mind clearly sees alternative courses of action and the nature of the continuance of both alternative actions in terms of karmic consequences. It is the "good" we do not see rather than the "evil" we do see that is the cause of karmic difficulty. Similarly, if we see nothing but "good," we do not see true good at all—since the latter exists at all times as the better or best alternative rather than as a thing in itself. One of the occult failures of modern world religions has been their failure to provide philosophical means by which "good" and "evil" are seen to have meaning only in their relationship one with the other. "As wise as serpents and as harmless as doves" means *knowledge* of the alternatives which line the path of choice.

Truth means the blissful correspondence of mind, speech and actions with one another. —*Taiteriya Upanishad*

HIDDEN HINTS IN THE SECRET DOCTRINE

(From p. 200 to p. 212, Vol. I.)

FUNCTION OF COMETS. Comets are the wanderers who, in the great struggle and rush of matter in any place where a system of worlds is to come into existence, act as aggregators or collectors of the cosmic matter until at last sufficient collections are made to cause the beginning of globes. *Italics on p. 201, v. I.*

CYCLES. There is always much discussion respecting this vast and interesting subject, not only in theosophical circles but outside as well. Indeed, the discussion was begun ages before our T.S. was formed. It will hardly be finished in our life. The dispute or difficulty has not been as to whether there are cycles governing men and affairs, for the most materialistic are wont to talk of the cycles of recurrence of diseases, wars, and the like, but about when any cycle begins, and especially the larger ones. One of the Moon's cycles is known, and that of the great sidereal vault is approximated, but when we come to such as the latter there is considerable vagueness as to what was the state of things 25,000 years ago. On page 202 of vol. I. the hint is given that the fundamental basis controlling number and ground-work of the cycles is laid in the very beginning of the cosmic struggle anterior to the aggregation of matter into globes and suns. For *(at foot p. 202)*,

> "This is the basic and fundamental stone of the secret cycles. . . ." The assertion that all the worlds (Stars, planets, etc.)—as soon as a nucleus of primordial substance in the *laya* (undifferentiated) state is informed by the freed principles of a just *deceased* sidereal body—become first comets, and then Suns, to cool down to inhabitable worlds, is a teaching as old as the Rishis.

Now in each system the "struggle" is different from every other, a different proportion arises, and, the percentage of loss or remainder being variable, the cyclic bases in each system differ from others. It is very plain, then, that our present-day scientists can know nothing of these original differences and must remain ignorant of the true cycles. Only the eagle eye of the high Adept can see these numbers as they are written upon the great screen of time, and in the whispers that reach us from the ancient mys-

---

NOTE.—This article by Mr. Judge was first printed in *The Path*, October, 1891. —Eds. THEOSOPHY.

teries can be found the information we are seeking. Who shall hear aright?

THE VERY BEGINNING. Definitely as to the very beginning of manifestation—not of this little system of ours, but of the one vast whole—it is not possible nor permissible to speak. But a hint of seductive nature is thrown out on *p. 203, 3rd par.*, where, taking us back to the first act in the great drama of which our puny play is but a short sentence, H.P.B. says that the secret science declares that when the one great all has been thrown out into manifestation seven special differentiations of IT appear, and from those seven all the countless fires, suns, planets, and stars are lighted and go forth. So that, although in various systems of worlds the cycles and the numbers and bases may differ and be any whole number or fractional number, the great and perfect number is still *seven*. But no man now among us can understand that great *seven* when it includes all numbers the mind may reach by chance or by calculation.

DO WE REMEMBER?

There have been moments in my experience when I have been sharply aware of the "strange intimations" of which Dr. Alexis Carrel writes—intimations which have scarcely been touched upon in the realms of science—"strange intimations," of worlds which I had known before, of places which in the spirit I had touched and heard and smelled. France was one of the places I had always known. From the time I was old enough to read, France had a reality for me, the one place in all the world I felt a fierce compulsion to see. Its history fascinated me, its pictures, its landscapes, its books, its theatres. It was, during all my childhood and early youth, the very apotheosis of all that was romantic and beautiful. And finally when, the morning before we were allowed ashore, the gray landscape of Brittany appeared on the horizon, there was nothing strange about it. I had seen those shores before, when I do not know. And afterward during all the years I lived there, during the war when I served with the French army and in the strange melodramatic truce between wars, it was always the same. Nothing ever surprised or astonished me; no landscape, no forest, no chateau, no Paris street, no provincial town ever seemed strange. I had seen it all before. It was always a country and its people a people whom I knew well and intimately.

—LOUIS BROMFIELD

ON THE LOOKOUT

Education and Religion

The decision of the United States Supreme Court to allow public funds to be used to pay for the bus transportation of children to parochial schools has dramatized the efforts of sectarian religious groups to "Christianize" American education. According to an article by Edwin H. Wilson in a special issue of the *Humanist,* "1947 will be known as the year in which sectarian forces made their greatest all out drive to break down separation of Church and State and obtain an access to public funds that could not fail to be discriminatory alike towards secularists and those of minority faiths." Mr. Wilson refers to the adverse decision of the Illinois State Court in the suit brought by Mrs. Vashti McCollum against the Champaign public schools, in her effort to prevent religious instruction (see Theosophy xxxiv, 39-40), and continues:

> In Washington a flood of bills, aiming in different ways to release public funds for "non-public, tax-exempt schools" (which would include parochial schools), seems to represent a clericalist effort to batter simultaneously at many points in the hope of forcing an entering wedge through to the public treasury. An analysis of some of these bills reveals an immediate danger to the maintenance of separation of Church and State—a cause in which every liberal educational and religious institution has a great stake.

"Non-Sectarian" Religion?

Lookout for March reviewed the Ethical Culture pamphlet, *Religion in Public Education,* by V. T. Thayer, which describes the growing pressure for religious instruction in the public schools. In the *Humanist* for Summer-Autumn, 1946, Mr. Thayer deals with this problem specifically by quoting from W. S. Fleming's *God in Our Public Schools,* a book published by the National Reform Association in 1942. Advocating that the public schools provide instruction in "non-sectarian" Christian principles, Mr. Fleming traces the "waywardness" of American youth to the exclusion of Bible reading from the schools, which occurred late in the nineteenth century. The Fleming program is summarized by Mr. Thayer:

> Instruction will have to do with tenets common to Christians, as Fleming identifies Christians. (In order to indicate what he means by these tenets and to include Unitarians as Christians, Fleming quotes approvingly from a Unitarian document issued in

1896. This states, "We deny the Christian name to none who acknowledge Jesus as Saviour and Lord. . . . The historical and miraculous proofs of Christianity are indeed essential and impregnable.")

To implement this general position, Fleming proposes that each state embody in legislation the principle that "The religious and moral standards of this state and nation are those of the Bible" and require instruction "with special emphasis upon the Ten Commandments, the Shepherd Psalm, the Proverbs, the Lord's Prayer, the Golden Rule, and the Judicial Oath used in all courts. High Schools shall also include courses in the historical and literary value of the Bible."

No Time For Indifference

. . . Such is the program of an increasingly aggressive group in this country. As these people see it, the life of the nation is at stake. Interpreting the law and Constitutional restrictions to serve their purposes, they have succeeded in re-establishing religious instruction in one form or another in the schools of a majority of our states. No longer can their activities be treated with indifference. Government and school officials commonly lack the courage with which to oppose these efforts, largely because they fear to do so will brand them as "opposed to religion." Consequently, by combining what amounts to a program of terrorism with arguments that few take the time to analyze or to refute, the movement sweeps forward with little resistance.

"Released Time"

The Fleming program is backed by Evangelical Protestant groups who militantly claim that only Bible Christianity can save the United States from moral and political ruin. France fell before German attack, it is asserted, because the French had repudiated God. "The verdict of History agrees with the word of Holy Writ that the nation that forgets God will perish." In the move to break down the separation between Church and State, Catholics are uniting with Protestant appeals for a return to religion. The Catholics, however, have a twofold objective. Uncertain as to the future of the parochial school, they now seek to promote religious instruction under public school auspices, and also, to secure state subsidies for the support of the parochial school system. Catholics are particularly vigorous in the campaign for "released time" for the religious instruction of school children. This latter scheme was recently approved by the California Court of Appeals in the Los Angeles District as in accord with the State Constitution.

The Constitutional Principle

It is evident that the supporters of any sort of program connecting the public schools with religious instruction do not really believe in religious freedom at all, nor do they understand the historic struggle to free American schools from all sectarian influence, nor the principles upon which that struggle was based. Sponsors of "released time" consistently overlook the reports of cities where the program has been tried and found a source of confusion and religious rivalry; they ignore, also, the great difference between allowing such privileges to several large and well established religious sects, and maintaining the equality of *all* religious views. It was the latter policy which the authors of the Constitution adopted and enacted as law, in Article VI, Sec. 3, prohibiting religious tests, and in the First Amendment, which denies Congress the right to establish religion or to interfere with its free exercise.

Evils of Segregation

Those who desire the spirit of these provisions of the constitution to be preserved in practice must now make themselves heard, in protests to school boards, in letters to the press, and in the courts. Such persons, as Mr. Thayer says, are not "content with the suggestion that their legal rights and the rights of their children are safeguarded by granting to children of dissenters the privilege of being excused from classes in religion. This misses the point entirely."

> The point at issue [he continues] is not whether the *parent* shall be free to excuse his child from classes in religion. It is rather *the right of a child* to an education in an atmosphere free from discrimination and segregation and the searing effects upon his personality that follow from setting him apart. Once a child crosses the threshold of the public school we should expect the school to further his identification with other children without consciousness of difference in race, color, nationality or creed. To do otherwise is to repudiate the moral as well as the educational principles implicit in a democratic education.

Dangers of Government Control

Among the various influences encouraging sectarian groups to work for religious indoctrination in the public schools is the dawning realization that Government—the power, that is, of the State—now threatens to become a controlling factor in personal life. The problem is far from simple, requiring a fresh analysis

of the relationship between moral and political freedom, and a critical evaluation of the consequences of establishing government as a vast welfare agency with the power to right every social wrong. Theosophists, in particular, have opportunity to recognize the growing threat to individual human rights that springs from external regulation in the name of social justice. Socialized medicine, for example, will in all likelihood mean the enthronement of orthodox medical theory as the sole authority in the science of healing, making it next to impossible for many parents to obtain the sort of treatment they desire for their children, except at special expense. Government regulation of public health has already invaded the area of private freedom in some states, through compulsory vaccination. Socialized medicine under political control will increase that invasion and work serious injustices on all minorities preferring other than orthodox medicine. It should be realized, also, that loss of this individual freedom will mean little to the many who trust blindly in "modern scientific research," with the result that the menace of state-controlled medicine must be opposed by the few.

Causes Lie Deep

A similar reliance on majority opinion in the matter of moral education is obviously a much greater danger, implying the right of the majority to regulate religious beliefs. Such delegation of individual responsibility to the State is no casual matter, but evidence that the modern tendency to centralization of authority is rooted in basic human attitudes—forms of ignorance which cannot be corrected simply by protesting specific encroachments when they are finally made into law. It is the task of minorities to study the structure of prejudice and the misuse of power, to discover their foundations in apathy and misconception. This kind of thinking alone is capable of guiding the intelligent practice of brotherhood, and it leads also, in the case of theosophists, to a profounder conviction of the need for widespread knowledge of the doctrines of Karma and Reincarnation.

Some Facts on Vaccination

The October-December *Newsletter* of the Citizens Medical Reference Bureau contains the interesting news that England's new National Health Act, just become law, "contains a clause abolishing the requirement that infants be vaccinated." This clause supersedes the "conscience clause" in the Acts of 1898 and 1907, abolishing the

requirement entirely. The British, apparently, are determined to assure medical freedom.

The same issue of the *Newsletter* reprints a letter by H. B. Anderson, Secretary of the Bureau, to the editor of the *Times-Delta*, Visalia, Calif., correcting statements made in an article appearing in that newspaper. The letter concerns the preventive value of vaccination for smallpox control. Mr. Anderson writes:

> Utah and California have both demonstrated that smallpox can be controlled without requiring vaccination. The few cases that were reported in San Francisco some months ago were traced to military personnel, all of whom had been subject to strict vaccination requirements.
>
> The 346 cases reported in 1945 throughout the entire country are so small as compared to the thousands upon thousands of fatalities from smallpox in vaccinated and revaccinated Mexico during the ten-year period 1923-1932 that it seems like quibbling to even discuss in what states these few cases occurred. The states making vaccination a requirement are largely centered in New England, but the absence of smallpox in these states is just as pronounced in states like Vermont, Delaware and in the rural districts of New York and in parts of New Jersey and Connecticut where vaccination is not required as it is in the states where vaccination is required.
>
> The United States Census Bureau reports a total of only 31 fatalities from smallpox during the four-year period 1941-1944 while it reports a total of 48 fatalities as "sequelae of preventive immunization, inoculation, or vaccination" during the same period.
>
> If those who believe in vaccination are vaccinated they have no reason to fear the unvaccinated.

Fish From the Sky

Hardly a member of the Fortean Society, nor one likely to believe in the miraculous, E. W. Gudger, noted ichthyologist of the American Museum of Natural History, contributed to *Science* for June 7, 1946, a lengthy note on the fall of fishes from the sky. Dr. Gudger believes it happens. Although never himself a witness of the phenomenon, he presents testimony both for its reality and for the edibility of the fish! He reports having collected some 78 reports of fishes raining from the sky, dating through 2,350 years, and notes: "My reports are accredited by my scientific colleagues everywhere." Apparently, an English professor at Northwestern University, having read one of Dr. Gudger's articles on the subject, had the temerity to speak condescendingly of his research in the *Atlantic*, calling the accounts reported by the ichthyologist "delightful . . . myths."

When Dr. Gudger finishes documenting his claim, there is very little left of the English professor's "scientific" reputation.

"Black Rain"

Students may find it of interest to refer to a discussion of one of Dr. Gudger's three scholarly articles on the subject, in Lookout, Theosophy xxii, 188. Charles Fort's *Book of the Damned* contains a number of instances of rains of fish (Chapter vii), and such and similar phenomena are cited in *Isis Unveiled* i, 413-15. H. P. Blavatsky attributes their true explanation to Van Helmont, Paracelsian scientist of the seventeenth century, who taught that "a quickening of germs is possible without calling in the aid of miracle to contravene natural law." More recent scientific, if heterodox, discussions of the principles of this sort of vital "precipitation" is reviewed in an article of the Astral Body series, in Theosophy xxviii, 400-403. Dr. Gudger is of the opinion that the fish are carried aloft in a waterspout, and later "rained" down. Some of the tales collected by Fort, however, will not submit to this explanation. Similar to the material collected by Fort and that in *Isis* is the "black rain" reported by a press dispatch to the New York *Herald Tribune* (May 24, 1946), from Ontario, Canada. On May 20 there fell on the 250 inhabitants of Erieau, a town on the north shore of Lake Erie, a "black rain" that left roads, sidewalks, houses and trees covered with black marks. "It's all so confusing," said one woman. "Just as if it had rained ink."

The Tinkering Moralists

The inertia of any social order is represented not only by those members who do nothing to improve the society of which they are a part, but also by those who do "a little something" without disturbing—*and without intending to disturb*—the outrageous injustices and criminal influences that effectively block all moral progress. The worst enemies of a culture are its own tinkering moralists, for they employ the energies of reform to stultify genuine reformation. A number of items, minor in themselves, will illustrate some ingredients of this inertia.

Take, for example, Dr. George W. Crane, who conducts "The Worry Clinic" in the New York *Journal-American*, and who devoted his column on Feb. 18 to "Case M-244," a problem raised by a Sunday School teacher. "M-244" complained that Mike, one of his 14-year-old students, refused to cooperate with the class and rejected every inducement to change his attitude. Dr.

Crane suggests that the boy may be over-compensating for a feeling of insecurity and inferiority, and recommends that the teacher try to be "a real friend" to Mike. The remainder of Dr. Crane's counsel we give in full:

> Then enlist Mike's co-operation in working out interesting tests on the contents of the Sunday School lesson. Today in the colleges we employ objective examinations that are really much like games. We call them True-False and "Multiple Choice" Tests.
>
> If you ask a boy, "Who killed Goliath?" he cannot even attempt an answer if he hasn't read or heard the story. So he assumes disinterest, or pokes a classmate in the ribs.
>
> But give him a typed sheet of statements containing a "multiple choice" item like this: "Goliath was killed by SAMUEL . . . JOB . . . DAVID . . . ESAU." Tell him to underline the name that completes the sentence.
>
> Even if he doesn't know, he then takes pleasure in guessing.

This is tinkering. The suggestion that the teacher come to a friendly understanding with the boy is unarguable. But Dr. Crane —conscious, no doubt, of the Standing of the Church in American life—makes no recommendation that Sunday Schools teach something of more obvious moral content than the slingshot murders, pillage and crime commanded, sanctioned or inspired by Jehovah. Where shall we look for one of the main sources of the scapegoat psychology which impels an individual to relieve inner frustration by "taking it out on" someone else? To the very "religion" which Dr. Crane would sugar-coat with Multiple Choices!

JESUITISM VERSES PSYCHOANALYSIS

Or take Monsignor F. J. Sheen, specialist in glamorous converts to Roman Catholicism. On March 8, Monsignor Sheen discussed psychoanalysis and confession at St. Patrick's Cathedral, and as the New York *Herald Tribune* account remarked drily, "Psychiatry came out a poor second." Psychiatry, Sheen explained, places the blame for all a person's ills on influences outside of himself or outside his control; no moral standard is offered by which to judge right and wrong. The church, on the other hand, believes in a free will, and gives the life of Christ as a standard. The *Tribune* report continues:

> The result is that a person suffering from a sense of guilt finds a chance to express it at confession, he explained, and once he has admitted it he can forget the past and look to the future. But the same person going to a psychiatrist is told that there is no such thing as guilt, he said. . . .

> Psychiatry's cures—attempting to explain away complexes or sublimating them—he termed "escapism." The church's way of admitting guilt, but then granting absolution, he felt, is a way of learning from the past and building hope for the future. . . .
>
> "There is no morbidity in confession," he said. "For you don't have to look so much at your sin as you do at your saviour and hope of salvation.
>
> "The real difference is that we believe in confessing our sins to God. Not to be conscious of sinfulness is the unforgivable sin."

Monsignor Sheen is desirous that men should be convinced of the depths of their depravity—starting with "original sin." Then, he says, they can "learn" from experience. He does not add that when the church convinces you that you are a *really* bad sinner and then grants you "absolution," what you have actually learned is that the Church can do more for your soul than you can. Dismissing psychiatry as "escapism," the Church nevertheless has *super*-escapes to offer the True Believers—and how grateful they are!

Confession—Before and After

This also is tinkering, though of a more skilful and therefore more dangerous sort. Monsignor Sheen appears to be upholding a system of morality. "Confession," he declares, has the inestimable value of making the individual conscious of whatever "sinfulness" is involved in his actions. But he ignores the fact that if one is not conscious of the moral quality—good or bad—of what he does, he cannot be morally responsible for his action. (Does not "sin" enter only when wrong action is performed wilfully and knowingly?) And if one *is* morally aware and morally responsible, then "Confession" is meaningless and "absolution" is impossible.

Thus the Church, while ostensibly championing the doctrine of "a free will," is effectively nullifying man's freedom as a moral agent. The practice of Confession is based upon the assumption that man has no inherent moral sense, cannot be expected to evaluate his conduct ethically, and (by means of a prescribed ecclesiastical ritual) can "forget," that is, *cease to be responsible for,* his actions. What materialism could be more profound? Such a pretense at "conscious" action is appropriate only for animals. It is, however, entirely compatible with the Biblical designation, the "sheep" of the Lord. And above all, it preserves the *status quo* of human irresponsibility which in turn is necessary to, and protected by, "Divine Grace." Psychiatry at least does not claim to be a moral science; Catholicism *cannot.*

The "Measure" of Honesty

Henry McLemore, who writes "In the Reviewing Stand," recently discussed "When is a Thief Not a Thief?" (New York *Journal-American,* Feb. 18) The riddle was suggested, he reports, because—

> A recent dispatch from Washington says the Government is going to try to round up all the loot brought home by members of the armed forces, and that it will prosecute anyone who refuses to yield an object worth $5,000 or more. . . .
>
> I was taught and you were taught [Mr. McLemore continues] that there were no degrees of honesty—that a man was honest or he wasn't. . . .
>
> The Government's ruling has made one thing a certainty:
>
> Any soldier who goes abroad to fight the next time must carry an appraiser with him to counsel him as to what he can steal and still remain an honest man.

The question here is not, How can the Government be so subversive of morality? but, Why is "the Government" so often apparently *forced* to compromise on fundamental ethical principles? This directs attention to the nature of the State, and to the fact that the morality of the State is always a "code"—never organically connected with the living morality of man as an individual. "Tinkering" is a device employed whenever the two moralities clash.

"Psychic Factors"

The *American Medical Journal* (Feb. 8) contributes an article on "Psychic Factors in the Development and Treatment of Obesity." We learn that the drug of choice to suppress excessive desire for food is amphetamine sulfate (Benzedrine sulfate), and one of the most important phases of amphetamine therapy is *the effortlessness of the patient* in reducing. A prevalent psychology is here represented. The theory is that since we are the prey of impulses and influences beyond and outside our control, the ideal therapy consists in relieving us of the unhealthy pressures, without any bothersome exertion of "will-power," which is a variable force anyway—when it is not wholly an illusion. It can safely be predicted that if this is the kind of attention to be given to the psychic factors in disease, we may indeed expect a more effortless escape from physical disease—but we must also be prepared for an increase in "involuntary" *psychic* diseases, of a more and more subtle nature. For the latter afflictions, passivity is the chief cause; what, *then,* will be the cure?

"It Doesn't Agree"

As a final sampling of the ingredients of inertia, we may quote from E. B. White, whose "Notes and Comment" in the *New Yorker* often isolate the casual compromises that mark the presence of deep (and generally unadmitted) hypocrisy in our society. In the March 22nd issue, "Notes and Comment" included the following:

> "The art of advertising," Mr. Stuart Cloete writes in his latest work, "The Third Way" (just out), "appears to be to make people want what they have not got, or become dissatisfied with what they have, which includes making them dissatisfied with what they are, and how they look. *Fundamentally it is the art of making people discontented and unhappy in order to sell them a product.* [Italics Mr. Cloete's.] There can be no honest advertisement beyond the statement that such-and-such a product is for sale at such-and-such a price, and that it will serve a specified purpose. Each should carry a chemical analysis, a government endorsement of purity, and a certificate of usefulness. Thirty percent protein means nothing if twenty-eight per cent of it is not digestible."

Advertising A Thesis

> "Fellow's got something there," we said to ourself after reading this, and turned to the ads in the morning's *Times* with a freshly critical eye. Well, we'll be absolutely damned if the second or third one we saw wasn't a Calvert whiskey Men of Distinction number, with Mr. Cloete in the starring role! His appearance—Coldstream Guards mustache, rich herringbone coat, contented grasp of highball, general air of wicker-chair, planterish leisure—was enough to make most people dissatisfied with what they are (workaday clods) and how they look (undistinguished), and the caption describing his drink—"so *rare* . . . so *smooth* . . . so *mellow* . . . that it is produced only in limited quantities. A matchless 'custom' blended whiskey, Lord Calvert is intended expressly for those who can appreciate the finest"—seemed clearly calculated to stir up discontent in the multitudes for whom this nectar, so cruelly limited in production, must forever remain a bright, upper-class chimera. In other ways, too, the advertisement made possible by Mr. Cloete appears eligible for the Cloete frown: no statement of the product's price or specified purpose, no certificate of usefulness, no Government endorsement of purity, and no chemical analysis beyond the words "86.8 proof, 65% grain neutral spirits." As Mr. Cloete would be the first to point out, sixty-five per cent grain neutral spirits means nothing if sixty-three per cent of it doesn't agree with your stomach.

"Forming Public Opinion"

Mr. Cloete's questionable "distinction" is that he is *not* distinguishable from the ordinary schizo-moralist. As long as one can declare a fundamental criticism of social habits and feel no strong obligation to try to bear out his convictions in his own conduct, the words he uses are without moral power. Such a critic does not uphold an ethical standard in any real sense; he simply *moralizes*. But, again, Mr. Cloete is not alone. Very few in our time have the moral balance to form public opinion in the manner described by H. P. Blavatsky in her *Key to Theosophy*. Forming public opinion, she writes—

> can be attained only by inculcating those higher and nobler conceptions of public and private duties which lie at the root of all spiritual and material improvement. In every conceivable case [one] must himself be a centre of spiritual action, and from him and his own daily individual life must radiate those higher forces which alone can regenerate his fellow-men.

"Flying Blind"

A realization is growing in our mechanical scientific age that the more instruments man invents, develops and uses, the more he must know about *himself*. The more powers of nature he succeeds in harnessing to his own purposes and directing toward human ends, the more he must be in control of his own powers—if his technical ingenuity is not to cost him more than it is worth. Specific illustration of this fact is provided by Wolfgang Langewiesche in his article, "Flying Blind" (April *Harper's*). Mr. Langewiesche, a research pilot and writer on aviation, reviews the gradual stages in solving the problem of flying by instruments alone, with "no horizon, no ground, no stars."

It was first determined that the airplane, in blind flight, went into a spiral cloud dive that the pilot could not control. Then it was discovered that the reason the pilot could not control the fatal spiral was that he could not *feel* it. The airplane's own tendency is to circle rather than to fly straight, and it is built so that when it circles *down*, it does so in banked turns. In Mr. Langewiesche's words, "the combination of bank and turn is mutually canceling: however extreme the maneuver, the bank kills the feel of the turn, the turn kills the feel of the bank; the pilot's sense of balance remains undisturbed."

> Not even a bird can tell. In a classic experiment, an Army pioneer of blind flight, Lt. Crane, threw a blindfolded carrier

pigeon out of an airplane. The pigeon went through a series of erratic maneuvers, fell off into a spiral dive and gave up: it simply let itself fall, holding its wings up at a high angle to brake its descent. It was a bird's equivalent to bailing out! That proved it: if a bird couldn't do it, blind flying by the natural senses was impossible.

"The Crux of Blind Flying"

The instrument perfected for registering the banked turn employed the principle of the gyroscope, for a spinning body obeys mechanical laws of its own, and is apparently exempt from others. But the invention of the turn indicator could not clear up the psychological blind spot. "The crux of blind flying—how an airplane *wants* to bank and turn into a spiral, and how the banked turn is by its very nature feel-less"—had first to be admitted in practice.

The pilot had to learn to trust absolutely the turn-gyro and disregard his own senses. Introspective investigation went forward to identify the hallucinations a blind-flier may experience. The airman had to learn to respond to the warnings of an instrument when he had no "simultaneous warning feel," Mr. Langewiesche relates. "The indication is completely 'cold,' quiet, intellectual. And intellect is no man's strong point while in flight."

The Human Factor

Langewiesche's writing suggests and includes the human factor to such an extent that it seems natural to mention how appropriate "blind flying" would be as a symbol for the "natural motions" of lower manas—the airplane "wants" to turn and bank. The turn-gyro, with its independent, self-regulated and reliable activity, corresponds in a way to Higher Manas, "the permanent individuality which gives to every man the feeling of being himself and not some other; that which through all the changes of the days and nights from youth to the end of life makes us feel one identity through all the period. . . ." No more than the airman can feel the banked turn, can an individual "feel" his own bias until—trusting to an indicator independent of his own senses—he comes out of his lopsided gyration.

"Punishment of the Animal"

Flying blind, as Mr. Langewiesche presents it, is psychic discipline. The problem, in short, is self-control, or resisting what he calls the "ground animal," for whom "up is where the

roof is, down is where the floor is." "The leans," for example, is a severe test of blind flying faith:

> As you cruise along, turn indicator centered, everything in order—your sense of balance, so long unemployed, disregarded and mistreated, now raises mischief with surprising insistence. It whispers that you are on your side—when you know you are not. And gradually you get split in two. Your eyes, your intellect, your hands and feet follow the instruments and fly the airplane straight and level. The rest of you slowly gives in to the crazed sense of balance, and after five minutes you begin to lean over sidewise in your seat, trying to keep yourself perpendicular in an imagined frame of reference. After ten minutes, you lean more. After twenty minutes you look as if you were bending over to pick something off the floor, and your head is nearly horizontal. And still your training keeps you flying straight. You don't realize that you are leaning. You realize only that you are under heavy strain, and you feel that you are flying the airplane on its side simply because the instruments tell you to do so—it can't be right. The longer this hallucination lasts, the more vivid it becomes. Unless you can break it, you are bound finally to give in, level your wings in imagined space, and thus in real space to spiral off.

"Ready To Fly"

"These things are by no means precisely understood," Mr. Langewiesche concludes. Self-hypnosis caused by staring too closely at the turn needle, is one of the theories advanced, and may be the most plausible, considering Mr. Langewiesche's formula of success:

> You conquer [the illusion] with your imagination. Your mind goes beyond the mechanistic reading-off of instruments, the stoic moving of controls according to formula, and reaches beyond the gray curtains. Then with your mind's eye, you begin to see the earth, the horizon and the sky, and your own airplane cavorting in it. You are no longer blind. Then you are ready to fly when the birds are walking.

Flying blind is, then, an "occult science," in the sense that definite human powers—and above all the power of self-control—must be developed in the individual who seeks to learn it. How far away are we from the "intelligently-moving vehicle" referred to in Mr. Judge's curious tale, "Where the Rishis Were" (*Letters*, p. 245)? How much of the Atlantean *Viwan Vidya*, "knowledge of flying in air-vehicles," is being recalled to the race mind? And how steadily is Theosophy, the occult science of *man*, filtering into that same race mind, so that power may be allied with self-knowledge?